



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

|                 |             |                      |                     |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
| 08/469,270      | 06/06/95    | COLLINS R            | 065777027001        |

26M2/0630

DAVID L. FEIGENBAUM  
FISH AND RICHARDSON  
225 FRANKLIN STREET  
SUITE 3100  
BOSTON MA 02110-2804

RECEIVED

P-826

|            |
|------------|
| EXAMINER   |
| JOHNSON, T |

JUL 02 1997

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2616     | 13           |

RECEIVED

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
BOSTON, MA

DATE MAILED: 06/30/97

JUL 3 1997 *hja*

DAVID L. FEIGENBAUM

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

*SEE  
Attached*

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| Docketed By Practice Systems |
| Action Code: _____           |
| Base Date: _____             |
| Due Date: _____              |
| Deadline: _____              |
| Initials: _____              |
| Record: _____                |

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| Docketed By Billing Secretary |
| Due Date: _____               |
| Deadline: _____               |
| Initials: _____               |

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| * No Docketing Required *     |
| Reviewed By Practice Systems  |
| Initials: <i>hja</i>          |
| Reviewed By Billing Secretary |
| Initials: _____               |

Applicant's  
copy

Attachment for Interview Summary, paper #10, for case 08/468,290.

Discussed the proposed Draft amendment Faxed May 22, 1997, which contained a proposed amendment to claim 1, and is provided as an attachment. The amendment now explicitly recites "compressing" in the body of the claim. It was primarily discussed as to whether or not the new amended claim overcomes the prior art of record, i.e. Murata et al. and Leach. The references of Murata et al. and Leach were used as two different rejections to claim 1 under 103 in the first Office Action. It was argued that the main distinguishing feature of the claim is that each pointer associates "one of said regions with one of said textures", thus providing for compression. It was argued that Leach only explicitly uses pointers for the position of the regions, and that Murata et al. provide for manipulating vectors rather than bitmaps.

The examiner indicated that the limitation of generating pointers associating regions with textures is not sufficient to overcome the prior art of record, due to at least by the breadth of the claim. It was further indicated that lines 2-3 of the present claim are new considerations, and that any amendment to the limitation of generating pointers to bring out that only one pointer is used for an association would also be a new consideration. However, the Mr. Sobon felt that such a limitation would be too narrow in breadth.